



## King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.4103/0972-4052.176535](https://doi.org/10.4103/0972-4052.176535)

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Kheur, M., Sethi, T., Coward, T., Kakade, D., & Rajkumar, M. (Accepted/In press). Evaluation of the effect of ultraviolet stabilizers on the change in color of pigmented silicone elastomer: An in vitro study. *Journal of Indian Prosthodontist Society*, 16(3), 276-281. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0972-4052.176535>

### **Citing this paper**

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact [librarypure@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:librarypure@kcl.ac.uk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

## Title Page

Category: Original Article

Title: Evaluation of the effect of UV stabilizers on the change in color of pigmented silicone elastomer -An In-Vitro Study

Running title: UV stabilizers on change in color

Authors:

1. Dr. Mohit G Kheur, PhD student, Department of Prosthodontics, Dr. D Y Patil Dental College, Pimpri, Maharashtra, India.
2. Dr. Tania Sethi, MSc, Department of Maxillofacial Prosthetics, Kings College, London, United Kingdom.
3. Dr. Trevor Coward, Reader / Consultant in Prosthetic Facial Rehabilitation, Department of Maxillofacial Prosthetics, Kings College, London, United Kingdom.
4. Dr. Dilip Kakade, Professor, Department of Prosthodontics, Dr. D Y Patil Dental College, Pimpri, Maharashtra, India.
5. Mr. Rajkumar M, Scientist D, CIRT, Pune, Maharashtra, India.

## Abstract Page

Title: Evaluation of the effect of UV stabilizers on the change in color of pigmented silicone elastomer -An In-Vitro Study

Aim and objective-To compare and evaluate the effect of UV stabilizers (Chimassorb 81 and Uvinul 5050) on the color change of pigmented elastomer.

Materials and methods- Two pigments -Red (P112 Brilliant Red) and Yellow (P106 Yellow) and two UV stabilizers Chimassorb 81 and Uvinul 5050 were studied. A total of 6 groups of 10 samples each were fabricated using a combination of the above colors and stabilizers. Group A1- Red control, Group A2- Red +Chimassorb 81, Group A3- Red + Uvinul 5050. Group B1-Yellow control, Group B2- Yellow +Chimassorb 81, Group B3- Yellow+ Uvinul 5050. All samples were subjected to ageing in an accelerated weathering chamber (Weather-Ometer). Color values L, a and b were measured at 500 and 1000 hours for all samples before and after weathering and change in color (Delta E) was calculated.

Results- All groups showed a significant color change. At 500 hours, Chimassorb 81 showed a statistically significant lesser change in both colors (red-3.66 and yellow-2.8) compared to their control groups (red-5.19 and yellow-4.9). At 1000 hours, both UV stabilizers showed lesser color change (A2-5.49, B2-4.28, A3-7.47 and B3-4.09) as compared to their respective control groups (A1-9.57 and B1-5.91). Overall, the change in the color with group A was more than group B.

Conclusion- Addition of UV stabilizers helped the reduction of color change. Chimassorb 81 showed a greater reduction in color change in both colors consistently at 500 and 1000 hours.

Keywords: Maxillofacial prosthesis, UV stabilizers, Color change, Pigments

## Introduction:

Rehabilitation of extra oral maxillofacial defects with silicone elastomers is a predictable and common treatment modality. Patients present with such extraoral defects commonly due to cancer resections, trauma, burns or even congenitally compromised body parts.<sup>[1]</sup>

The success of a prosthesis lies in it being biocompatible, durable, inert, and easy to manipulate and color. One of the main drawbacks of prostheses made from silicone elastomers is that they degrade physically and discolor over a period of time.<sup>[2-7]</sup> Unfortunately, this requires the prostheses to be remade periodically, generally every 1-2 years, increasing the cost of rehabilitation.

The color change in silicone elastomer has been attributed to factors like UV radiation, temperature changes, humidity, and the use of adhesives, cosmetics, cleansing agents, and exposure to body fluids.<sup>[8-13]</sup>

Current research strategies have been directed towards improving the mechanical properties and color stability of pigmented elastomers. The addition of ultraviolet (UV) stabilizers, thermochromic pigments and opacifiers to improve the color stability of pigmented elastomers have been tried in the past with varied results.<sup>[14-18]</sup>

UV stabilizers are a broad term including UV absorbers (UVA) and Hindered amine light stabilizers (HALS), both having different modes of action.

UV degradation occurs on constant exposure to UV rays produced by the sun and depends to a large extent on their duration, extent and intensity. UV stabilizers have been used extensively in

the polymer <sup>[19]</sup>, paint, cosmetic and plastic industries as well as for wood <sup>[20]</sup> and cellulose fabrics <sup>[21]</sup> to prevent color degradation and increase the life of these products.

In order to understand the effect of the UV stabilizers in the presence of pigments, their effect in terms of color change over a period of time must be analyzed. The change in color following ageing, expressed as delta E is calculated. A delta E value greater than 1 (Kiat-Amnuay <sup>[14]</sup>, Lemon <sup>[8]</sup>, Haug <sup>[22]</sup>), 2 (Beatty <sup>[23]</sup>, Polyzois <sup>[24]</sup>) and 3 (Kantola <sup>[15]</sup>) has been considered perceptible to the human eye.

Previous studies by Haug et al. <sup>[22]</sup> and Hatamleh et al. <sup>[25]</sup> on pigmented samples concluded that color change in elastomer occurs as a result of weathering, silicones having inherent pigment instability. Gary et al. <sup>[26]</sup> and Hatamleh et al. <sup>[25]</sup> have shown that the change in color has been attributed to the degradation in the elastomer itself.

Tran et al. <sup>[16]</sup> studied the effect of UV stabilizers Tinuvin 213 and Tinuvin 123 on organic and inorganic pigments. They demonstrated some color change in all samples at both their weathering locations. The amount of color change decreased significantly in certain pigmented groups. No study has evaluated the effect of commercial pigments in additive stabilized elastomers.

The use of weathering machine has been commonly used in research studies as it follows standard parameters taking into account humidity, temperature changes and UV radiation and gives a better estimate of the overall weathering. <sup>[7,8,17]</sup>

This research study is an attempt to evaluate the effect of UV stabilizers on the color change of pigmented silicone elastomer, using two pigments – red and yellow.

## Materials and methodology:

Two commonly used pigments - Red (P112 Brilliant Red, Technovent Pvt. Ltd., UK) and Yellow (P106 Yellow, Technovent Pvt. Ltd., UK) were tested in this study. The UV stabilizers that were used as additives were FDA approved UV absorber Chimassorb 81(BASF, India) and HALS Uvinul 5050 (BASF, India).

A commonly used platinum based maxillofacial silicone elastomer Z004 (Technovent Pvt. Ltd., UK) mixed in a 1:1 base: catalyst ratio was used for the study.

A total of 6 groups of 10 samples each were fabricated using a combination of the above pigments and stabilizers. Group A and B were the principle groups of the pigments red and yellow respectively which are further subdivided according to the stabilizer used.

The resultant groups were as follows: (Table 1)

Group A (Red): Group A1-Red, Group A2- Red +Chimassorb 81, Group A3- Red + Uvinul 5050.

Group B (Yellow): Group B1-Yellow, Group B2- Yellow +Chimassorb 81, Group B3- Yellow+ Uvinul 5050.

The A1 and B1 groups served as control groups with only pigment and no UV stabilizer.

The fabrication of the mould for the samples involved Stainless steel sheets of 4mm thickness that were wire cut (Precision Wire EDM machine, Sodick, Germany) into square plates of 10cms X 10 cms. These were paired into sets of 3. The middle sheet was further wire cut to

obtain square shaped cavities for samples of 2cm X 2cms. Holes to retain nuts and bolts were made at the 4 corners of the sheets to secure the assembly.

1% by weight of respective UV stabilizer was added in Groups A2, A3, B2 and B3. 0.2% by weight of the respective pigment was added to the subgroups of A and B. These were as per recommendations by Tran<sup>[16]</sup>, Beatty<sup>[23]</sup> and Gary et al.<sup>[26]</sup> The stabilizer and pigment for Groups A2, A3 and B2, B3 and the pigment alone for Groups A1 and B1 were weighed carefully using a digital weighing scale, added and thoroughly spatulated together with the silicone (base +catalyst) manually for 5 minutes to obtain a homogenous mix. The silicone was vacuum mixed for 20 min under 30 inch Hg. The moulds were carefully loaded and clamped under pressure for 24 hours to allow the silicone to polymerize. Care was taken to slowly fill the moulds to prevent the possibility of air entrapment. The cured samples were examined carefully and those with surface porosities or impurities were discarded.

The samples obtained were cleaned thoroughly with acetone and cotton. They were tested at 0 hours to obtain the baseline color.

The samples were subjected to ageing in a Weather-Ometer ( Xenon Arc Ci 4000 , Atlas Material Testing Technology, USA ). Alternating light and dark cycles for a total of 180 minutes completed one cycle. The light cycle (120 minutes) included an irradiance of 340nm of 0.55W/m<sup>2</sup>, humidity of 50% and a chamber temperature of 47 degrees Celsius with water spray for 60 minutes. This was followed by 60 minutes without water spray. The dark cycle lasted for 60 minutes with a temperature of 38 degrees Celsius, humidity of 95% and irradiance at 340nm of 0.55W/m<sup>2</sup>. These parameters were selected keeping in mind tropical climatic conditions.

Testing of the samples was carried out at intervals of 0, 100, 500 and 1000 hours. The samples for all groups were thoroughly cleaned with cotton and acetone prior to testing. Each sample was measured three times and an average of the readings was considered for its analysis.

The color variables L,a,b according to the CIE(Commission Internationale d'Eclairage) Lab system were measured using a spectrophotometer (TES-135 Color Meter, Instruments and Machinery Sales Corporation, Mumbai, India ) before and after ageing.

The L\* parameter corresponds to the degree of lightness and darkness (100 ideal white, 0 ideal black), while a\* and b\* coordinates correspond to red or green chroma (+a = red, -a= green) and yellow or blue chroma (+b = yellow, -b= blue), respectively. The Delta E (change in color) was calculated for each sample using a software with the formula  $\Delta E = ([\Delta L^*]^2 + [\Delta a^*]^2 + [\Delta b^*]^2)^{1/2}$ , where Delta L\*, Delta a\* and Delta b\* are the difference in L, a and b values before and after ageing.

## Results:

Average Delta E values obtained for Groups A and B are seen in (Table 2 and 3 ) and represented in Figures 1 and 2.

A one-way ANOVA was applied to compare the mean values of the 6 groups. A further analysis, the Post Hoc Tukey test was carried out to compare between groups. The significance level was considered at 0.05.

At 500 hours, for the red pigment, both the UV stabilizers showed a lesser color change than the control (5.19). When the 2 UV stabilizers were compared, Chimassorb 81 showed the least



change (3.66). The color change between Chimassorb 81 and the control group was highly significant ( $P<0.01$ ).

At 500 hours, for the yellow pigment, both the UV stabilizers showed a lesser color change than the control (4.99). A comparison between the UV stabilizers resulted in Chimassorb 81 showing the least change (2.81). The color change between Chimassorb 81 and the control group was highly significant ( $P<0.01$ ).

At 1000 hours, for the red pigment, both the UV stabilizers showed a lesser color change than the control (9.57). In comparison between the UV stabilizers, Chimassorb 81 showed the least change (5.49). The color change between Chimassorb 81 and the control group was highly significant ( $P<0.01$ ) whereas that between Uvinul 5050 and the control was significant ( $P<0.05$ ).

At 1000 hours, for the yellow pigment, both the UV stabilizers showed a lesser color change than the control (5.91). When the two UV stabilizers were compared, Uvinul 5050 showed the least change (4.09). However, the color change between Chimassorb 81 and the control group as well as Uvinul 5050 and the control group was significant ( $P<0.05$ ).

A comparative analysis amongst the UV stabilizers revealed that the performance of the Chimassorb 81 was consistent. Samples with Chimassorb 81 (groups A2, B2) showed a lower delta E value at 500 and 1000 hours except for in the yellow pigment at 1000 hours.

Amongst the Pigments (Groups A and B), group A (Red) showed a much greater color change than group B (Yellow).

Discussion:

Silicone elastomers have shown to degrade by undergoing a color change and deterioration of their mechanical properties during the course of their use. This is attributed to a multifactorial etiology involving primarily the exposure to ultraviolet rays.<sup>[27]</sup>

The literature has reported on UV degradation of elastomers and a subsequent change in their mechanical and optical properties and is said to be dependent on the duration, extent and intensity of the exposure.<sup>[7-11,24]</sup>

Research strategies for stabilization of elastomers have included the use of UV stabilizers, thermochromic pigments and opacifiers.<sup>[8,14-18]</sup> UV stabilizers have been used extensively in the polymer, paint, cosmetic and plastic industries as well as for wood and cellulose fabrics to prevent color degradation and increase the life of the products.<sup>[19-21]</sup>

A UV stabilizer is a broad term including UV absorbers (UVA) and Hindered amine light stabilizers (HALS), both of which have different mechanisms of actions. The empirical requirements for optimal action of the stabilizers are high solubility, minimal diffusion and high distribution homogeneity.<sup>[19]</sup>

Such attempts at stabilization of elastomers have yielded mixed results. Kantola<sup>[15]</sup> found that thermochromic pigments were very sensitive to UV radiation and not suitable for prosthetic application whereas Kiat-amnuay<sup>[14]</sup> studied various concentrations of opacifiers and found that they prevent color degradation overtime. In this study, Chimassorb 81, a benzophenone UV absorber (UVA) and Uvinul 5050, an oligomeric Hindered amine light stabilizer (HALS) were studied.

In the past, varying concentrations of UV stabilizers have been documented by researchers with mixed results. Chu <sup>[17]</sup> used 1.5% weight UVA and found that it was effective in reducing yellowing of the elastomer, Lemon <sup>[8]</sup> used 12%, .25% by weight UVA and found that these did not protect the samples and Tran <sup>[16]</sup> used .75% by weight UVA and HALS and found that this was effective only for certain pigmented groups. In this study 1% by weight of UVA (Chimassorb 81) and 1% by weight of HALS (Uvinul 5050) were used for Groups A2, B2 and A3, B3 respectively. These additives are FDA approved biocompatible additives manufactured by BASF Chemicals, Mumbai, India Division.

To know the effect of these UV stabilizers on color change, an accelerated weathering chamber is used to simulate weathering conditions and includes parameters like UV lighting and radiation, water spray, humidity and temperature. A combined effect of these can probably cause a more pronounced change compared to that produced by one parameter alone. UV irradiation can contribute to enhancing cross linking leading to breaking down of chain bonds and decomposition of the elastomer.<sup>[25]</sup>

The effect of UV radiation has been known to enhance cross linking, break down of polymer chain bonds, reduce polymerization and decompose the elastomers, all of which may contribute to color instability.<sup>[25,28]</sup> It is likely that Chimassorb 81 compound is able to better absorb UV rays from sunlight and dissipate this energy throughout the polymer matrix, thereby preventing degradation.

As reported by Mancuso <sup>[29]</sup>, color change of the elastomer itself can be attributed to inherent chemical alterations in the silicone and a probability of absorption and adsorption of substances that can take place from the surface of the silicone.

Amongst the stabilizers studied in this research, Chimassorb 81 (UVA) showed the least color change. Chimassorb 81, chemical name Methanone, [2-hydroxy-4-(octyloxy)phenyl]phenyl,- and molecular weight of 326.4 g/mol; is preferably used for thick films of materials (>100µm) especially plasticized PVC and rubbers. The thickness of the samples or absorption depth in this study was 4mm contributing to protection of the polymer.<sup>[30]</sup>

Chimassorb 81 is an UV absorber and as the name suggests, soaks up harmful UV rays from sunlight converting this energy into heat energy which is then dissipated.<sup>[30]</sup> It prevents the formation of harmful free radicals. It is probable that Chimassorb 81 absorbs heat energy, preventing photosensitization. Its color is transparent to visible light and does not alter the appearance of the elastomer thereby contributing to its stabilizing effect.<sup>[19]</sup>

Uvinul 5050 on the other hand is a HALS that protects the basic material structure and helps neutralize the harmful photochemical free radicals. HALS regenerate themselves and hence probably provide protection over a longer period of time.<sup>[31]</sup> This explains for its better performance over UVA Chimassorb 81 at 1000 hours.

Both red and yellow pigments are commonly used in color formulations to obtain skin colors. However, red pigment degraded to a larger extent than yellow. These results are consistent with previous studies by Kiat-Amnuay<sup>[14,30]</sup> and Beatty et al.<sup>[23]</sup> These may be attributed to the organic nature of the red pigment being more affected by irradiation.<sup>[25]</sup>

Future research strategies may involve different types of elastomers, including those different in their compositions and manufacturing protocols. A variety of other UV stabilizers, their combinations and concentrations can be evaluated on physical and mechanical properties. Evaluation over longer periods of time, combining methods of ageing to simulate natural conditions and stabilization of the pigments can be researched on.

## Conclusion:

Within the limitations of the study, it can be concluded that both the UV stabilizers performed well and helped to reduce the color change in pigmented samples as compared to the control samples. UVA Chimassorb 81 consistently showed a lesser color change in both pigments. A comparison between the pigments revealed that those samples fabricated with red pigment showed a greater color change than yellow.

## References:

1. Bulbulian AH. Maxillofacial Prosthetics: Evolution And Practical Application In Patient Rehabilitation. J Prosthet Dent.1965 May –June;15:544-69.
2. Gunay Y, Kurtoglu C, Atay A, Karayazgan B and Gurbuz CC . Effect of Tulle on the mechanical properties of a maxillofacial silicone elastomer .Dent Mater J 2008; 27(6):775-9.
3. Haug SP, Moore BK, Andres CJ. Color stability and Colorant effect on maxillofacial elastomers. Part II: Weathering effect on physical properties. J Prosthet Dent. 1999;81:423-30.
4. Hulterstrom AK, Ruyter IE . Changes in appearance of silicone elastomers for maxillofacial prostheses as a result of aging. Int J Prosthodont1999;12:498-504.
5. Mohite UH, Sandrik J, Land MF, Byrne G. Environmental factors affecting mechanical properties of facial prosthetic elastomers. Int J Prosthodont 1994;7:479-86.
6. Beumer J, Curtis TA, Maurinick MT . Maxillofacial Rehabilitation: Prosthodontic and surgical considerations, St.Louis, Elsevier publications. Pg-436.

7. Kheur MG, Sethi T, Coward T, Jambhekar SS. A Comparative Evaluation of the Change in Hardness, of Two Commonly Used Maxillofacial Prosthetic Silicone Elastomers, as Subjected to Simulated Weathering In Tropical Climatic Conditions. *Eur J Prosthodont Rest Dent* 2012 20(4):1-5
8. Lemon JC, Chambers MS, Jacobsen ML, Powers JM. Color stability of facial prostheses. *J Prosthet Dent* 1995;74:613-8.
9. Chen MS, Udagama A, Drane JB. Evaluation of facial prostheses for head and neck cancer patients. *J Prosthet Dent* 1981;46:538-54.
10. Fine L, Robinson JE, Barnhart GW, Karl L. New method for coloring facial prostheses. *J Prosthet Dent* 1978;39:643-9.
11. Jani RM, Schaaf NG. An evaluation of facial prostheses. *J Prosthet Dent* 1978;39:546-50.
12. Hanson MD, Shipman B, Blomfield JV, Janus CE. Commercial cosmetics and their role in the coloring of facial prostheses. *J Prosthet Dent* 1983;50:818-20.
13. Andres CJ, Haug SP, Munoz CA, Bernal G. Effects of environmental factors on maxillofacial elastomers: part I--literature review. *J Prosthet Dent* 1992;68:327-30.
14. Kiat-Amnuay S, Johnston DA, Powers JM, et al: Color stability of dry earth pigmented maxillofacial silicone A-2186 subjected to microwave energy exposure. *J Prosthodont* 2005;14:91-96.
15. Kantola R, Lassila LVJ, Tolvanen M, Valittu PK. Color stability of thermochromic pigment in maxillofacial silicone. *J Adv Prosthodont* 2013;5:75-83.

16. Tran NH, Scarbecz M, Gary JJ: In vitro evaluation of color change in maxillofacial elastomer through the use of an ultraviolet light absorber and a hindered amine light stabilizer. *J Prosthet Dent* 2004;91:483-90.
17. Chu CC, Fischer TE. Evaluation of sunlight stability of polyurethane elastomers for maxillofacial use. *J Biomed Mater Res* 1978;12:347-59.
18. Han Y, Zhao Y, Xie C, Powers J, Kiat-amnuay S. Color stability of pigmented maxillofacial silicone elastomer: Effects of nano-oxides as opacifiers. *J Dent*. 2010; 38:100-5
19. Feldman D. Polymer Weathering: Photo-Oxidation. *J Environ Polym Degrad* 2002;10(4):163-73.
20. George B, Suttie E, Merlin A, Deglis X. Photodegradation and photostabilisation of wood e the state of the art. *Polym Degrad Stab* 2005;88:268-74.
21. Czajkowski W, Paluszkiwicz J, Stolarski R, Kaz'mierska M, Grzesiak E. Synthesis of reactive UV absorbers, derivatives of monochlorotriazine, for improvement in protecting properties of cellulose fabrics. *Dyes Pigments* 2006;71:224-30.
22. Haug SP, Andres CJ, Moore BK. Color stability and Colorant effect on maxillofacial elastomers. Part II: Weathering effect on color. *J Prosthet Dent*. 1999;81:431-8.
23. Beatty MW, Mahanna G, Dick K, Jia W. Color changes in dry-pigmented maxillofacial elastomer resulting from ultraviolet light exposure. *J Prosthet Dent*.1995;74:493-8.
24. Polyzois GL, Tarantili PA, Frangou MJ, Andreopoulos A. Physical properties of a silicone prosthetic elastomer stored in simulated skin secretions. *J Prosthet Dent* 2000;83:572-7

25. Hatamleh MM, Watts DC. Effect of Extraoral Aging Conditions on Color Stability of Maxillofacial Silicone Elastomer. *J Prosthodont* 2010;19:536–543.
26. Gary JJ, Huget EF, Powell LD: Accelerated color change in a maxillofacial elastomer with and without pigmentation. *J Prosthet Dent* 2001;85:614-620.
27. Polyzois GL. Color stability of facial silicone prosthetic polymers after outdoor weathering. *J Prosthet Dent* 1999;82:447-50.
28. Goiato CM, Pesqueira AA, Moreno A, Micheline dos Santos D, Haddad MF, Bannwart LC. Effects of pigment, disinfection, and accelerated aging on the hardness and deterioration of a facial silicone elastomer. *Polym Degrad Stab* 2012;97:1577-80.
29. Mancuso DN, Goiato MC, Dekon SF, Gennari-Filho H. Visual evaluation of color stability after accelerated aging of pigmented and nonpigmented silicones to be used in facial prostheses. *Indian J Dent Res* 2009; 20(1):77-80.
30. Kiat-amnuay S, Mekayarajjananonh T, Powers JM, Chambers MS, Lemon JC. Interactions of pigments and opacifiers on color stability of MDX4-4210/type A maxillofacial elastomers subjected to artificial aging. *J Prosthet Dent* 2006;95:249-57.
31. Jia H, Wang H, Wenxiu C. The combination effect of hindered amine light stabilizers with UV absorbers on the radiation resistance of polypropylene. *Radiation Physics and Chemistry* 2007;76:1179–1188.



FIGURES:




Figure 1: Color change at 500 hours




Figure 2: Color change at 1000 hours

TABLES:

GROUP A-RED	GROUP B-YELLOW
Group A1-Red control	Group B1- Yellow control
Group A2- Red +Chimassorb 81	Group B2- Yellow +Chimassorb 81
Group A3- Red + Uvinul 5050	Group B3- Yellow+ Uvinul 5050

Table 1: Groups and subgroups studied

	CONTROL	CHIMASSORB 81	UVINUL 5050
RED	5.19	3.66	5.06
YELLOW	4.9	2.8	3.26

Table 2: Average Color change (Delta E values) after 500 hours of ageing

	CONTROL	CHIMASSORB 81	UVINUL 5050
RED	9.57	5.49	7.47
YELLOW	5.91	4.28	4.09

Table 3: Average Color change (Delta E values) after 1000 hours of ageing

